Thursday, April 4, 1929, 1:00 A.M.

Henry Rosenthal delivered the student sermon at the Seminary yesterday. He cast a spell upon the class by the wizardly of his style. Taking the subject that I had suggested to him last Thursday night and drawing upon the interpretation that I gave in class of the meaning of God as liberator, he delivered a sermon that throbbed with emotion. It was not the kind of cheap emotion displayed by the popular orator, but the restrained and highly articulated emotion of the poet. The one word that he uses most frequently is rhythms as though he were passionately striving to catch and express the deepest rhythms of the cosmos as they find expression in human life. The other word which he is fond of using is "troubled," indicating his sensitiveness to whatever interferes with the rhythms of reality. He certainly possesses an inner beauty of soul which spurns the ugly and the spurious in art morality and religion, and which reveals itself in new incisive and most surprising associations of ideas. Most remarkable is his attitude to Jewish life. Fully alive to its vulgarities and its sterility he is nevertheless deeply in love with it. If he will retain that love he will undoubtedly make some valuable contribution to its future development.

This afternoon the committee on reorganization of the ZOA met at Lipsky's office. What I learned from the discussion which was carried on a high plane and dealt with fundamentals was that in presenting the function of the ZO it is essential to stress the need of intensifying Jewish life not as an end in itself but as a method of effective propaganda. This will prevent the Zionist organization from becoming involved in abstract and fruitless discussion of Diaspora nationalism and Diapsora Zionism, ~~xxxxxxx~~ discussions that will widen the gap between Zionists and non-Zionists and will un-

necessarily introduce the question of loyalty to American life. Rothenberg was the one who helped me realize the wisdom of avoiding theoretic formulations of Zionist aims. This approach is characteristically English, but is far more likely to make for constructive peace and tolerance than the continental approach which always leads to ruinous logomachies.

In the few words that I exchanged with Lipsky after the meeting I gathered from him that he would consent to change the instructions sent out by the ZOA to its members with reference to the election of delegates to the coming Congress in accordance with the suggestion I made in my letter of yesterday to Mrs. Szold.

This evening Ira Eisenstein came to see me about the petition which his committee (the Students' Welfare Committee) had presented to Prof. Marx, Davidson and Finkelstein with regard to changes in the curriculum. His account of the way in which Davidson is unfitted to teach the course in Talmud with class A (he said it was a case of [illegible] to see the difficulty Davidson has of keeping up with some of the students in their analysis of an argument in the Tosefot), of Finkelstein's working out his course as he goes along, of Hoschander's reading his notes word by word and refusing to have a copy made and given to the students so that instead of [illegible] copying they might use the hour in discussion and likewise of Marx's refusal to give the students prepared bibliographies instead of making them copy the names of each book and reference, revealed a condition of intransigeant determination to give the minimum amount of time to the students and to use the Seminary primarily as a means of enabling them to go on with their own writing and research. They are interested primarily in establishing a name for themselves and only incidentally in preparing the men for the

ministry. In fact they are not interested even in the latter purpose, since they have no concern whatever in qualifying the students for the actual work that they are called upon to do after they are graduated. The situation in the Seminary is scandalous from every point of view. Of late the morale of the students has suffered another decline due to the awarding of Brush Scholarships. There has arisen a rift between the twenty men who are receiving those scholarships and those who are not. The latter are treated as citizens of second rank. There has developed a kind of class war between the two grups, the recipients of the scholarships being regarded as the capitalists and the non-recipients as the proletariat. Further complications have arisen on account of the special permission which Dr. Adler has granted to some of the recipients to do more outside work than according to the terms of the scholarship they are entitled to do.

My advice to Eisenstein was that he should get his committee to turn their attention chiefly to the need of enlarging the faculty and securing an active and efficient registrar who could give all his time to the Seminary.

* * * *

Friday, April 5, 1929, 5:00 P.M.

A man by the name Speer who is a member of the Cleveland Jewish Center came to consult me about getting a successor to Solomon Goldman who has accepted the call to Chicago. I gave him the names of those I considered the most able from the standpoint of ability as speakers and capacity to exercise a wholesome Jewish influence on the young. I suggested Mortimer Cohen, Coblenz and a few others of that type. He asked me what I thought of Epstein. I replied that I did not believe he was sufficiently progressive in his outlook on Judaism. If Finkelstein would consent to go he would certainly be acceptable. I also mentioned Jacob Kohn.

He was still here when it was time for me to go to the Seminary so I asked him to accompany me in the taxicab. I there happened to put a question to him which has led to my regretting that I recommended any one for the position. The question was "How does it stand with the Jewish population in the neighborhood of the Center?" His answer which at first tended to be evasive finally discolsed the truth that before five years are over the Center will be deserted by the most important part of its membership. That was probably the determining factor in Goldman's decision to make the change. It would, therefore, be wrong to ask any of our graduates whose congregation is not confronted with usch a problem to give up his position and to accept the position at the Cleveland Center.

It is extremely inconvenient to be forever harried by a queasy conscience. As though the annoyance of being too hasty with my recommendations to Mr. Speer were not sufficient, something else had to occur to trouble me. The Seminary students at the suggestion of Prof. Marx organized a speaking club for the purpose of acquiring greater facility in extemporaneous address. They arranged to have the club meet Friday afternoons. I volunteered to come and give my criticism. I went this afternoon. Bokser delivered a very good talk and I pointed out the changes that he ought to make in his sermon. The men seemed pleased that I came and offered them my help. But as I went downstairs and walked into the office I found Prof. Davidson dictating some work to one of the girls. For want of having anything to say I dropped the phrase about the speaking club meeting at the inconvenient hour of [illegible]. With a turn of the satirical Davidson at once saw in it an allusion to the miracle of the [illegible] I asked him not to repeat the joke to anyone, because the students hearing of it might be offended. They are very sensitive on the matter of the rabbinate and the work of preaching. For that

matter I am too and their sensitiveness has been augmented by the practice in vogue among the members of the Faculty to speak contemptuously of rabbis and preaching, a practice that was inaugurated by Shechter. I certainly do not want to be a party to this tendency to make the students develop a feeling of inferiority; yet I have involuntarily been made a party to it, because I doubt very much whether Davidson will be able to refrain from broadcasting the joke. I t happens to be too good a joke to keep to oneself.

* * * *

Saturday night, April 6, 1929

This morning I stayed away from services so that I be not tempted to preach. Lena felt it necessary to explain my absence by saying that I had neuralgia. When I questioned the ethics of her fabrication she answered "Isn't it true that you had neuralgia a week ago Saturday. No one except Rosenblatt took the trouble to find out whether my neuralgia was gone. They assumed I suppose it would be gone by the time the services were over.

In the meantime I had a chance to think about the article which is to give a reconstruction of the Jewish past. The following are some of the ideas that occurred to me:

In general the task of reconstructing Jewish life calls for 1) a new philosophy of Jewish life and 2) a new program which is to be based upon that philosophy. In the new philosophy of Jewish life the first important step is achieving a correct perspective of the Jewish past. Formerly every Jew had a definite idea, wrong as it may have been how Judaism happened. After all whatever place in the world we assign to the people we belong to depends upon how we conceive that people to have come into being. Nowadays the Jewish past is a mere smudge to most Jews. They do not accept the tradi-

tional version neither they have been given any new version that might help them orient themselves in their environment. The modern Jew will never be able to utilize his past as a means of rendering the present significant unless the traditional ideas that have accumulated about the past will be disentangled and there emerge out of the confusion an orderly succession of three distinct types of civilization which have hitherto been reckoned with as one unfform type. Each type passed into the one that followed it so gradually and unconsciously that it takes a long time to overcome the shock of discovery that Judaism has been identified with three different modes of civilization.

The first type of civilization was theophanic. Its social habits institutions, sanctions, literature and arts were permeated with the assumption that the God whose people they were was went to manifest himself to those that sough Him and was ever ready to make His will known to them. Theophany while an extraordinary experience was not an unusual experience. In fact without it they would have felt completely at a loss how to live with one another and would not have had the courage to fight their enemies. The center of gravity of their spiritual interests was entirely this world and the now. That type of civilization lasted during the first five or six hundred years of Israel's stay in Canaan.

The second type was theocratic. Theophany as a normal experience was a thing of the past. Instead of theophany the Jews had the Torah which was regarded as having been given by God. In addition there was the Temple where it was believed God was somehow present in a truer sense than elsewhere. All the social habits etc were dominated by the belief that the low estate of the Jewish people was only temporary due to God not yet having manifested Himself as the prophets had presaged but that as soon as God saw fit He would

manifest Himself through some extraordinary act of power, that all of Israel would be gathered from the various lands of the dispersion and that the nations would come to recognize the hegemony of the God of Israel. The center of gravity was no longer in the here and the now nor was it definitely removed from the here and the now. In this state of suspense Judaism found itself until the beginning of the common era.

The third type has been other worldly. This world and this life are treated in all the constituents of the civilization as an interim state between the past when men lived in the sight of a self manifesting God and the future when men shall again live thus. The center of interest is definitely shifted to the hereafter when God will bring back the order of life which obtained before man corrupted the world, etc.

The type of civilization which Judaism will develop into will be the spiritual. It will in many respects be a return to the first period but of course on a higher level. Its center of interest will again be the here and the now since the best way of providing for the future is to realize to the full the opportunities of the present. Likewise the assumption that communion with the divine is a normal experience will become operative again except of course, that instead of the divine manifestation taking the form of an outward visible experience it will be looked for in the inwardness of the mind and heart.

* * * *

Tuesday, April 9, 1929, 9:15 P.M.

Saturday night I saw the Guild play "Man's Estate." The theme was the conflict between sex love and the impulse to aesthetic creation. The treatment was commonplace, amusing where it consisted of a take off on an adolescent who dreamt of accomplishing great

great things as an architect but vulgar and confusing when it attempted to interpret the conflict between love and ambition. The conflict ended in a settlement pleasing to the Philistine playgoers.

Sunday afternoon Dr. Schneiersohn delivered a lecture on modernist tendencies in education before the students and faculty of the Teachers Institute. He dwelt on the inadequacy of the spiritist behaviorist and psychoanalytic approach to the study of the human being, but did nothing more than assert the need of a science which reckons with the total reality of the human soul.

In the evening I saw Sholem Aleichem's "Stempenin." The love scenes were boring; the rest was enjoyable.

Called on Unterberg last night and discussed with him SAJ. I urged him to favor the plan of establishing a fund but he was sceptical as to its feasibility. Our people are not interested in establishing anything of a religious or educational character other than a synagogue for themselves.

The discussion in the class of the Training school revealed again how averse a number of the students are to helping to upbuild Jewish life. I could see that a number went into Jewish social work for the simple reason that they were not wanted in general social work, and they would like to feel no other responsibility than helping Jews to solve their immediate problems of an economic character, or if compelled to deal with the spiritual problems to be in a position to take a perfectly neutral attitude. The discussions arose from the statement that I made concerning the privilege that should

underlie the program of Jewish life in America, to wit, the Maximum of Jewishness compatible with political and economic conditions.

Karpf informed me that at the conference called at the instance of Elisha M. Friedman last Saturday the following were elected to arrange the content: Benderly, Lowenstein, Krapf, Schulman and Poole.

* * * *

Wednesday, April 10, 1929, 10:30 P.M.

I am very much concerned about the likelihood of Honor giving up his position at the Teachers Institute to go to Chicago. This afternoon I happened to call up Alex. Dushkin in reference to Ira Eisenstein. In the course of the conversation Dushkin let slip a question as to what I thought of Honor's next more, or something to that effect. It seems that Honor has accepted Dushkin's offer of a position in Chicago The offer has been of long standing. Honor wrote to me about it a couple of months ago. It is certainly very tempting from a financial point of view, and probably also from the standpoint of greater opportunity for individual achievement. I do not see that I have a right to feel the least resentment against Dushkin for making the offer and against Honor for accepting it. But Honor's going will certainly complicate matters for me next year at the Teachers Institute. With the number of men students at the Institute continually on the wave and the Yeshiva Teachers Institutue graduating ever larger numbers of men students the prospect of the Seminary Institute is far from bright. To a large extent Benderly is to blame for the failure of the Bureau to win the support of the laity and to command greater resources than it does at present. In the last analysis it is the lack of resources that has compelled one man after another whom the Bureau trained to leave New York for other fields of Jewish educational activity. If Dushkin, Gamoran, Berkson

Golub and Honor had stayed here they might have in time built up a chain of Jewish schools and have laid the foundation of a workable system of Jewish education. Jewish educational effort in New York City seems to have gotten into a blind alley and I am beginning to believe that Benderly is the one man who is mainly responsible for this impasse. His attitude toward Honor is certainly the chief contributing cause to honor's leaving N.Y. The year before Honor went to Palestine, he held a position in the Bureau. Benderly was not satisfied with the results achieved, but instead of directing him to do his work more efficiently he just dropped him without notice or explanation. At the beginning of this year when Honor, Bragin and I had the conference with Benderly, Benderly made Honor feel very cheap by the disparaging remarks he made about Honor's work.

When I come to think of it, I believe that all this talk about our people -- I mean those engaged in Jewish educational work -- being idealistic is bunk. All of us (and I do not except myself) are interested first and foremost in making a comfortable living. Here is Honor accepting a position that will bring him $7500. To earn that amount in the general school system I imagine would require greater ability and capacity for hard work than Honor possesses, to say nothing of the far more limited opportunity that a man has when engaged in the general school system to cultivate any cultural or creative interests outside the narrow field to which he is confined. Very few professors in Columbia earn as much as I do in the Seminary and those who do have to give considerably more time to the students than I do. The same is true all along the line. This is a deplorable state of affairs. If we who make our living from Judaism had been willing to forego the ambition to shine, had been satisfied with less and had devoted ourselves to the cultivation of Jewish personalities through warm personal interest in the lives and characters of

the students we would by this time have built up a small army of loyal Jews.

At the Faculty meeting which took place this afternoon the letters from Rudkinsky and Barnett were read in which they asked the Faculty to reconsider its refusal to graduate them this year and mentioning the plan I had suggested that they be allowed to graduate provided they promise not to accept a full time position next year and to devote most of their time to doing the work I shall outline for them. All except Finkelstein voted to graduate them this year but to withhold their diplomas until they shall have satisfied the requirements of the Homiletics department. Finkelstein explained his negative vote on the ground that these men will accept full time positions and ignore what they had promised. He mentioned the fact that congregations hold out tempting offers which prevent the Seminary from holding its students and graduates to the standards that it sets up for them. As an instance he cited the case of the Flatbush congregation which is looking for a successor to Harry Halpern. Magil who is only a second year man spoke there. They were ready to elect him the next evening. All the expostulations of Finkelstein that they had no right to take a xxx student were of no avail. Their contention was that Halpern who had been with them for more than ten years is being graduated this year. If Magil will not be their rabbi it will be because he is not satisfied to accept only $4000 which they offer him. He insists upon their giving him $5000.

After what I said about the men in the educational group being mercenary, what shall I say of these rabbis haggling for salaries which those men succeeded in getting only after years of hard labor? The whole thing is sordid. Men who go into spiritual work of any kind either ought not to be dependent upon that work for

a livelihood or ought to be celibates so as to be free from family responsibilities.

* * * *

Thursday, April 11, 1929, 11:30

I asked Honor to come to see me. He came about 3:30 and stayed till 5:00. I broached to him the question about his accepting the offer of the position in Chicago. He explained that Dushkin had been after him for the last three years to come to Chicago. This time Dushkin asked him for a final answer yes or no. Before replying to him Honor wants to make sure that his wife will be satisfied to leave New York. He is waiting for an answer from her. In case the answer will be in the affirmative then he will weighthe opportunities and drawbacks of his position at the Institute with those of the position offered him.

He said that only my reply to the letter he wrote me some months ago seemed to indicate that I was under the impression that it was mainly the question of salary that troubled him. While salary was a factor to be reckoned with it was secondary to other considerations chief among which was the fact that the Teachers Institute was conditioned in its progress by the arbitrary experiments which Benderly is conducting in the Hebrew High School: 1) The Dalton plan which may work with certain pupils but is inoperatic with a goodly number who in time drop out; and 2) the special group 'Kvutzah) consisting of the most promising of the boys.

I stated to Honor that if these experiments will work injury Benderly will not hesitate to drop them as quickly as he adopted them. At least the check that the Institute will exercise by examining the High School graduates that apply for admission will help to demonstrate the unworkability of the experiment if it is unwarranted by results.

I was very much pained to learn that Honor's father who is a physician has lost his practice because he has become an invalid himself and that Hnor will have to contribute to his support. While of course I must qualify what I said in my remarks of yesterday about the wrongness of salary being a consideration in spiritual work, I still feel that when one is working for a cause he must not use that cause mainly as a means of providing the needs of kith and kin.

A self-appointed committee of three men of whom one by the name of Slonim was the spokesman, called this evening. They are members of Rabbi Signer's congregation. Their mission was to get my opinion about the form of prayers introduced by Signer in the Friday night service. Acting on my suggestion I made to him a few months ago after his congregation formally adopted the SAJ program he worked out a form of prayers which while retaining the framework of the traditional ritual presents an opportunity fo introducing new reading material from week to week. To make it possible for such material to be introduced he succeeded in getting one of the members who was anxious to back the move ~~xxxxx~~ to improve the service, to defray the cost (about $600) of publishing the material in loose leaf form.

The committee claimed that this innovation was forced on them without the consent of the majority of the congregation. The majority prefer tne old prayer book because it is universally used. They are averse to innovations not so much because they approve of the beliefs and aspirations voiced in the traditional ritual as because they do not want to be different from the rest of the Jews. When I pointed out to them the absurdity of praying for the restoration of the sacrifices they were not in the least non-plussed. They were not even familiar which parts of the ritual I referred to. I had to show them and even then they were able to follow with diffi-

culty what I was trying to explain to them. Slonim who seemed to be the most intelligent among them admitted that he was not a "Zaddik" and didn't exactly believe what the prayers implied, but what he feared was that the innovation would keep away people who might otherwise join the synagogue.

When they began asking me questions about the United Synagogue and Rabbinic Assembly I lost my patience and told them that they had no right to expect me to tell them who was in a position to give an authentic decision in such matters. If my opinion was not good enough for them they should consult whomever they liked. They evidently had expected me to furnish them with arguments which they might use against Signer.

Lena suggested that I should call up Signer and advise him not to make an issue of the prayer book. I was about to act on the suggestion but then I said to myself "If this is to be a fight for honesty in religion then why should we not be prepared to pay the price of battle. The forces of obscurantism must not be allowed to have their way; to be intimidated by them is to be false to our trust. Signer is old enough to know how to act for himself without my seeking to protect him."

As I was taking a walk on Central Park West on the east side of the street two automobiles collided at the 77 St. crossing. One was a private car drven by a chauffeur, the other was a taxicab. There were two men in the taxicab besides the driver. I was walking south (That was about 10:30 P.M.) My attention was attracted by the private car speeding at what seemed a breakneck rate. There were no other cars on the avenue within a block or two either way. As I turned to look at the speeding car the taxicab emerged from the street that runs through the park. It was traveling at a much

slower pace than the private car. They both collided on the west side of the avenue circling around till they came to a stop at a point in 77 Street somewhat west of the avenue.

I gave my name to the taxicab driver because I felt indignant at the reckless speed with which the chauffeur had driven down the avenue. Upon second thought, however, it occurred to me that the taxicab driver should have stopped to let the car pass. Both the chauffeur and the taxicab driver were at fault.

* * * *

Saturday night, April 13, 1929, 11:30 P.M.

Yesterday afternoon I spent two hours at the Seminary with the students helping them with their practice speaking. I had at least the satisfaction that my suggestions were constructive and likely to be of practical value to them.

Just before the Sabbath set in as I was working on the sermon, one of my front teeth, which is a pivot tooth, came off the pivot. For the moment it seemed that all my plans about speaking tomorrow would come to nought and in general that my routine would have to be suspended. Fortunately I thought of Judge Rosalsky's brother who is a dentist and who has his office nearby. I went to him and he cemented the tooth back again in its place.

How the least thing that goes wrong upsets all our calculations. The more complex the adjustment upon which we come to depend the greater the possibility of upset and the less the very security which we seek to attain in the process of rendering the adjustment complex. There is surely not better way of fulfilling Nietzche's recommendation to live dangerously than by increasing life's complexity. Yet somehow people associate living dangerously with the return to nature.

At the supper table last night Judith flared up at some remark I made against a proposed dish as being indigestible and she let loose a flood of invectives against me because of what she termed my insistence upon a soft and sheltered mode of life. I controlled myself and did not utter a single word in reply but I have been in low spirits since. The outbreak revealed to me how little Judith and I have in common, a fact which came home to me all the more as I reflected upon the way in which she avoids me almost sudiedly for fear that I might ask her to read with me on any subject whatever. As a rule we find fault with parents that they give their time to everybody except to their children. Now I see how untrue to facts that charge is. What would I not give to have my children spend any of their time with me. I certainly do not want to deprive them of the company of their friends, especially of any male friends they might cultivate, but it seems to me that my company ought to be as interesting to them as that of some of their girl friends. Yet it is they who never find any time for me. I had hoped that when Judith would be grown up that I would renew my youth through her, that I would have in her a collaborator in my efforts to upbuild Jewish life. The vocation of teaching music places her in an excellent position to cooperate with me. Yet she doesn't show the slightest inclination to read, study or work on any project jointly with me.

Only this evening after having explained all this to Lena in answer to her question why I have been so glum all day I was made aware how happy a father must be whose child shares his interests. Lena and I went to the studio of Enrico Glicenstein. As we arrived there we met him in the company of his son Romano, who had been on his way out. The father Enrico forgot to introduce his son to us. When the son left I asked Enrico whether the young man was his son. He replied "Surely this is my son. He is the better part of myself."

This morning I preached a sermon on "The Jewish Attitude Toward Proselytizing." I am pleased that the effort was not altogether wasted because it fell in with the problem I am working on at present, the problem of formulating a correct characterization of each of the three epochs of Jewish history. I believe I have hit upon the essential trait of each of the last two epochs. During the theocratic epoch (see p. 288) the main interest of the Jews was centered upon the hope that God would display His power and glory by some visible act whereby they would not only regain their national independe, but also be restored to their own land from the various lands where they were scattered and achieve prestige as the most blessed of all nations. During the otherworldly epoch their interest was ~~xxxxxx~~ centered upon the Torah as the indispensable means to salvation or a share in the world to come. Such a statement as ψ ע"ש is unthinkable in the second epoch, but entirely in keeping with the apotheosis of Torah in the third. It was worthwhile to me to slave a whole day yesterday and to preach to an unresponsive or half sleepy audience today to hit upon this distinction between the two epochs of Jewish history.

This afternoon I had as visitors Dr. B. Elzas and Dr. Salo Baron. I met them last week while visiting Dr. Tschernowitz at the Mt. Sinai and invited them to the house this afternoon. We discussed the conception of Judaism as a Civilization. Elzas wasn't able to articulate his objections against that conception except to mention that any attempt to formulate a conception of Judaism that rules out from Judaism any one who feels as a Jew is to be dondemned. In addition he repeated the irrevant jest ab ut eating "gefillte fish" as being a part of Jewish civilization. Otherwise he left the field all to Baron and me. To this moment I don't know what Baron was

driving at by trying to corner me with his "Socratic method" of questioning. For a long time we engaged in a futile logomachy at the end of which Baron admitted that I must be correct since I hold the same views as he does. Our discussion lasted two hours.

Glickstein Glicenstein

This evening I had the treat of my life. I visited Enrico Glicenstein at this studie at 65 W. 56 St. Little as I am able to appreciate sculpture and etchings I could not but marvel at some of his work. I thought his "Jeremiah" superb. I probably reveal an uncultivated taste in admiring his "Sphinx" but I cannot see wherein it is inferior to Rodin's much cried up "The Two Natures" (or some such name). His illustrations of the Book Samuel were infinitely more challenging to me than Dore's.

Then the talk. As he showed me some etchings dealing with Christian themes he remarked "I have to be a Marano. I find it necessary to express my Jewish feelings through Christian themes because the Jews do not give me a chance to work only in Jewish subject matter." The greater part of the conversation turned upon the blindness with which our people are afflicted, the blindness to the dependence of the Jewish future upon the creation of permanent art values. He did not allude to the destructive influence of the traditional prohibition of the plastic arts, but I cannot see how one cn forgive the many generations of teachers this ~~xxxxxxx xxxxxxx~~ stupid error by which they have impoverished Jewish existence. I was always wondering what became of all the latent genius for the plastic arts, which must have existed in large measure judging by the sudden outburst in recent years. Glicenstein answered that question tonight. He said that formerly anyone who possessed artistic ability accepted Christianity and usually employed his talent to create anti-Jewish art. I shouldn't be surprised that there is a great deal of truth to that statement.

I was especially amazed to learn of the barbarism which still inhered in some of our so-called enlightened and philanthropic Jews. Altheimer the former president of Temple Bethel tried to explain to Glicenstein the reason the new Temple Emanuel could not avail itself of Jewish art work was that the congregation still upheld the prohibition against imagery in the synagogue. When one considers how far these people have gone in their imitating gentile custom and art, one cannot but wax indignant at this idle excuse for not encouraging creativity in the field of Jewish art. If the synagogue is to be the sole institution where Jewishness is still to have a foothold, then why not use it as a medium for eliciting from the Jew whatever he can contribute to the aesthetic values of life? That Reform Judaism should stand in the way of this function of the synagogue shows that its professions of devotion to the synagogue are hollow and insincere.

The other instance of barbarism was the story about the bust of Nathan Straus which I saw there. When I inquired whether Straus expected to have it cast in bronze Glicenstein told me that after he had worked upon the bust, Straus suddenly took it into his head that the bust must be broken up for fear that it would bring on his death. If Glicenstein hadn't practically snatched it away from Straus' home it would have been shattered.

I tried to find out from Glicenstein how much he needed to be able to proceed with his work without being distracted by financial worries. He said that if he had $5000 a year he would have all that he needs. When one considers that with the amount expended by an ordinary congregation it would be possible to enable ten men like Glicenstein to devote themselves to Jewish art. One must conclude that we are indeed an p.301 . The miracle of the Jewish people is not so much its continued existence in the face of outward odds as its continued existence in the face of inner stupidities.

"Our life is either a perpetual self renewal or a languid death." Jose S. Rodo.

A page a day keeps the blues away (July 11/29)

If you want to experience the thrill of making a Golem, keep a diary, but you must not complain when in the end the Golem turns out to be none other than yourself. (July 11, 1929)

"The modern man...has become greatly interested in his moods. The precise manner of his likes and dislikes ~~have~~ has become very important. There is no telling just what he is or what he may become, but there is a certain breathless interest in having one of his selves watch and comment upon the mischief and frustration of his other selves." W. Lippman in Preface to Morals, p. 113, (August 27, 1929)

"We must pass like smoke or live within the spirit's fire."AE

If you want to know what is meant by a "futile figure in an aimless age," read this journal. Dec. 21, 1929

"I'm tired of livin' but afeard of dyin'." (Heard over the radio, Dec. 26, 1929)

"One talks as one lives, not out of conviction but helplessly" (Don't Call me Clever by Lawrence Drake, p. 156, Dec. 28, 1929).

* * *

Tuesday, April 16, 1929, 1:00 A.M.

Yesterday Dr. Solomon Zeitlin of Dropsie College called and had lunch with me. The purpose of his visit was to have me publish in the SAJ Review his paper on the calendar which he had read recently before the American Oriental Society. He is mainly interested in getting 150 reprints of it without cost.

At 5:30 Sachler the playright called to tell me that he was available for some kind of a position that would earn him a livelihood. The money he had saved up to enable him to devote himself to literary work has all given out.

The entire evening last night was taken up with the informal gathering ostensibly called by Israel Unterberg in honor of Harry Liebovitz for his service to the SAJ. The actual purpose, however, was to take steps to meet the deficit. I told those present (H. and A. Liebovitz, Rosenblatt, Joe Levy, Thomson, Goel, Osserman, Bromberg, Siegelstein, Louis Lubetkin, Sam C. Lamport, Wener, J. Klein and S. Lubell, Spielberg and about three others) that I regarded creative work of an esthetic character the most vital need in Jewish life today. I was mainly interested in establishing a fund, the income of which might be devoted to creative effort. The majority of those present disagreed with me as to the dispensability of the congregation. An attempt was made to get those present to raise $20,000 but without success.

I am entirely at a loss what my next step should be.

Tonight I spent a pleasant evening at Dr. Israel Davidson's. He had invited Drs. Zeitlin, Enelow, Alexander Marx and me to meet George F. Moore.

* * *

Saturday night, April 20, 1929, 12:00 midnight

If people would realize what rich treasures lie hidden in Judaism they would tear their hair for their failure to exploit them.

It is said that Imber the author of Hatikvah in a state of drunkenness passed by a meeting hall where the Zionists were singing his Hatikvah. The rain was coming down in torrents and he wanted to

enter the hall, but it was crowded and the man at the door, not recognizing Imber, refused him admittance. I want to use this incident in the concluding chapter of "Judaism as a Civilization" as an analogue ~~of~~ to what might happen to the Jewish people. Having given to the world its history and ideals as articulated in its Sacred Scriptures, it is liable to be reduced to the necessity of standing as a neglected outsider hearing the chorus of people as they take up its noble strains, but unable to join them in their song.

* * *

Sunday, April 21, 1929, 12:30 noon

Is it possible that I have made a discovery? I have a hunch that the writings of the "false" prophets have been incorporated into the Bible. I could never find a satisfactory background for Isaiah 13 and 14. Does it not seem plausible to assign those chapters to the "false" prophets whom Jeremiah denounced (Jer. 29,8)? May this not be the reason for the anonymity of these prophecies? If it should turn out that the "false" prophets were the authors of the anti-Babylonian prophecies, they would have to be credited with the new consolatory trend that we find in biblical prophecy. It does not seem plausible to ascribe such lofty style and diction to any but the survivors of the great prophetic movement, who had been carried captive into Babylon.

* * * *

Monday, April 29, 1929, 10:30 P.M.

I had been scheduled to deliver the lecture on Dynamo at the Newark YMHA. About five o'clock I discovered that I hadn't the notes which I had used in my talk at Far Rockaway. I was in a panicky state of mind, because I simply could not recall the outline of the address. Fortunately Miss Machlowitz still had her stenographic notes and she was able to furnish me with a transcript in time. The lecture

was well received. Before two days were over I got my check of $100 for it.

At the S'dorim this year we had Nahum Sokolow and his daughter the physician, Enrico Glicenstein, Maurice Karpf and his wife.

I should very much like to record some of the conversation but I haven't the patience to write diary. The work on "Judaism"etc is giving me no rest.

* * *

Wednesday, May 1, 1929, 1:00 A.M.

Tonight belongs to the eighth day of Pesah. My thoughts are all a tangle and I find it hard to unravel them. Having saved for tomorrow the sermon which I should have given this morning I spent a good part of the evening reading Stefan Zweig's Adepts in Self Portraiture. The reason for my interest in that book is apparent. I am trying to measure my pigmy self alongside the giants described in that book. I want to discover what it is that disqualifies me for noteworthy achievement. It is not lack of sensibility. In fact I become so choked up with emotion at the slightest provocation that I become even less articulate than I ordinarily am. Nor is it the lack of analytical power. My misfortune is a treacherous memory.

What is this passion to achieve? The psychologists give it a name, egomania and imagine they have dismissed the question. This habit of laying the ghost of problems by the utterance of a name goes back to the days when medicine men would lay the ghosts of ancestors by some incantation with names. I find much more meaning to the surmise that this passion to achieve is the manifestation through the bodies of human beings of the creative urge of the universe. Why does this passion fulfill itself in a few and is frustrated in

most human beings? Because apparently the physical structure of a few is more adapted to the self-fulfillment of that passion. The nervous system of these superior men is undoubtedly better organized to retain impressions and to react to the environment than is the case with most people.

But why is it that we of inferior breed should be afflicted with this passion to achieve? Why do we not resign ourselves to our limitations? Because life is not organized on a principle of economy. In its spendthrift fashion it wastes itself in infinite futilities. In the form of lust it lives on in those who can no longer procreate. In the form of passion to achieve it manifests itself in the vast multitudes who are too impotent to achieve. If one accepts his limitations and contents himself with passive enjoyments of the achievements of others he is forever pilloried by these superior men and their ~~xxxxxx~~ imitators as a stupid clodhopper. If, on the other hand, he struggles to overcome his limitations only to end in frustration, he is made to appear ridiculous. So long as people of mediocre ability are not asphyxiated or oslerized, they should be informed by these same superior men of the proper role for them. With all the great things that all the great men have achieved, they have only succeeded in making their own names illustrious, but as far as telling us inferiors how to live, they might as well not have existed. Nor do I believe that with all their greatness they will ever be of much help to us. They only know how to make us feel cheap in our own eyes, how to make sport of our little ambitions and irredeemable frailties.

It is surprising that there hasn't arisen a Karl Marx to preach class war between the genuinely superior and the genuinely inferior human beings, for in actuality there is such a war going on all the time. It is just as real as the war between the capital-

ists and the proletariat. As I think of it the Russian communists seem to have declared war on intellectual superiority. Of course they have to retain in their service men who are naturally gifted or else they could not exist. But I suspect that they regard submission to men of that type as a necessary evil. Anyhow the facilities made possible by invention so augment the powers of the ungifted as to encourage them into believing that they might gratify their passion to achieve. Disappointed as they must ultimately be in this hope, they feel themselves despoiled by fate, and those whom fate has favored with a greater measure not merely of the passion but the power to achieve. Such frustration is likely to make for war against inherent superiority. To be sure, such war is bound to be suicidal, but when one is faced with frustration he is not daunted by the possibility of self-murder.

Where does all this lead to? It indicates the need of training mediocre men not to cherish impossible ambitions, and superior men to help their mediocre fellow beings to adjust themselves to their limitations instead of adding to their sufferings by holding them up for contempt.

* * *

Thursday, May 2, 1929, 11:15 P.M.

When I woke up yesterday afternoon after a short nap I realized that the annual siege of the hayfever had begun. I had felt perfectly well in the morning and never suspected that the attack would come so early in the year. Except for a short respite this morning when I had to preach I have been feeling quite miserable (physically) since yesterday.

The sermon I preached this morning dealt with the importance of art to Jewish life and religion. The attendance was rather large (more than 300) and I spoke with a good deal of vigor and enthusiasm. I am at my best whenever the preparation of the sermon results in a fruitful idea. The feeling of satisfaction that the time and energy spent upon the preparation will not prove ~~entirely~~ entirely wasted and that there will remain with me a residue which I can turn to good account in work of a more permanent character give wings to my words. In the present instance, the thought which I came upon had to do with the conditions that give rise to art. I said that art arises from a sense of the worthwhileness of its object. A work of art is that which begets in the observer an attitude of worthwhileness of the object, person, or experience which that work depicts. This thought will help me to formulate my ideas on the need of giving to aesthetic values a much more important place in the Jewish civilization than they occupied in the past.

If it were not for the comfort which I derive from the thought that I can make further use of the idea I came upon in the course of my sermon preparation I would ~~not~~ have the mulligrubs pretty badly. There were only two people who expressed their appreciation of the sermon, Pilichowski (the painter of the Hebrew University picture) and Enrico Glicenstein, who were in the audience. The rest of the people acted as if they had forgotten that I ever said anything that should make the least bit of difference in their lives. I must smile at myself the way I try to elicit a few words of original reaction from Lena to what I have to say from the pulpit. With no one to make me feel that my words have any effect, I try several times during the day to get Lena to tell me what she got out of the sermon. After a few leading questions in which I ask her what

she thought of this remark or that remark she says in quite a solemn voice "That was very good." That's about all she has to say.

I am sure I am not such a fool to hunger for praise. I simply want to feel that I act as an efficient cause in the lives of others. This it seems to me is a perfectly normal and legitimate yearning. If I can not shape material things, I want to mold minds. What hurts me is that the futility of my efforts is due not to their being of a kind that is foreign to the purpose avowed by the people in coming to hear me, but to their avowed purpose being only skin deep. Water off a duck's back leaves more traces behind it than my words leave in the minds of the listeners.

Why then do I not do the self-respecting thing and discontinue preaching? Why do I not break away from this corpse? It is because I have not sufficient confidence in myself that I will make good.

When the Sokolows were with us on the nights of the S'dorim Nahum Soklow's daughter* remarked to Lena that people think he is over seventy; as a matter of fact he is only sixty-five. Tonight I came across a jubilee book in honor of his fifieth anniversary which was celebrated in 1902. This makes him out to be a man nearly seventy-seven. To be so well preserved and active as he is is nothing less than genius. (* Later I learned that I was wrong.)

At the Seder Sokolow joined in the recital of the Haggadah with a good bit of gusto. He did not omit a single paragraph. He is a charming conversationalist, but much as he tries to make himself understood, most of our people, especially the younger set, lack the background to appreciate his allusions. The first night he spoke an idiomatic English. Krivonos asked him about his interviews with the Pope. He wanted to know whether Sokolow had to go through the

usual ceremonies of kissing the ring on the Pope's finger. Sokolow explained that private interviews are conducted quite differently. The last interview took place after the successful negotiations with Cardinal Gaspari of the business pertaining to the mandate. The ceremony consisted in his being led by two or three priests of distinction from one stage of the passage to the next, the entire passage consisting of five stages. But when he arrived in the room where the Pope was all ceremony was dispensed with.

At the second Seder we had Glicenstein, the sculptor, with us. This fact was responsible for Sokolow's speaking in plain Yiddish.

When I omitted in the Haggadah the sentence [illegible] he demurred and characterized my omission as a criticism of the ancients.

At the table he told an interesting story about the Maggid of Dubnow and a rival Maggid who being more learned in the law was popular with the scholars but not with the masses. Once they both happened to come to the same town on a Friday afternoon and repaired to the local rabbi for permission to preach in the synagogue the Sabbath following. The rabbi refused to show any preference. So both were scheduled to speak. First came the rival of the Dubnow Maggid and took as his text

which he explained as follows: There are some maggidim who preach in . Such preachment is mere blabber. But I shall preach to you of the mysteries of the Torah which have their source in ancient truth. After the introduction he proceeded with the main theme of his Drush. When the turn came for the Dubnow Maggid to preach he took the same verse which he interpreted as follows: It is true that I preach in but they are at least my own. There are maggidim who make it their business to preach the mysteries of the Toran, but those are old things and everybody knows them.

I was interested in the way Sokolow spoke of Baron Edmond Rothschild. I can't imagine Weizmann speaking of him in that tone. It was the tone of the Yeshiva Bahur who speaks in bated breath of multimillionaires as of superior species of human beings, with a psychology all their own. Where do we poor mortals come in to try to fathom their minds to appreciate their anxieties or comprehend their tastes? Sokolow depicted the surprise and joy of Rothschild on learning that the French Government had addressed to him (Sokolow) a note recognizing the Balfour declaration.

* * *

Saturday night, May 4, 1929, 8:30 P.M.

In the course of the conversation at the Seder, Glicenstein remarked that he was at work on a statuette of Spinoza inspired largely by Sokolow's recent book on Spinoza. He then went on to describe the way in which he represented Spinoza, remarking that he thought it best to divest the figure of clothes. Truth, he said, is naked. Sokolow was taken aback by the idea of a Spinoza without clothes. "Do you believe in representing people whom we know, people of recent or contemporary history, unclothed? Would you for example, make a nude statue of Bismarck?" "Yes," replied Glicenstein, "I would picture him as Siegfried."

This afternoon I saw Glicenstein's Spinoza modelled in clay. The clay is still wet. He still has to work on it. It is too suggestive of Rodin's Thinker to possess sufficient individuality, especially the pose of the legs which are entirely too virile for the emaciated chest. The face is like a combination of Mendelssohn and Bergson. There is, in fact, more of the latter than of the former, which is remarkable, in view of the fact that Glicentstein had never seen a picture of Bergson.

Glicenstein also showed me his recent pen drawings. When he came to us to Seder he brought some of them along with him. They were for the most part illustrations of the Haggadah text. I liked especially the one illustrating "Had Gadya" and "Moses the prince seeing the slavery of his brethren." Today he showed me additional sketches illustrating the stories in Genesis. They appeal to me much more than Dore's illustrations. I wish there could be found a publisher for them.

He imagines that we rabbis ought to be able to exert enough influence upon the members of our congregations to have them avail themselves of his skill for their homes and synagogues. He can't forgive Israel Goldstein for having said to him "I am a small man and without power." To talk that way, said Glicenstein, is to talk like Saul. And this afternoon he found fault with Poole. When he realizes how little I can do for him, I suppose I will come for a share of opprobrium. I can't blame him for being so indignant at the indifference which our well-to-do Jews show toward him and his art. They spend millions of dollars for all kinds of useless trumperies. Why they should not make it possible for such a man to earn enough so that he might be able to enrich their lives and the life of the Jewish people in general with artistic Jewish values is not hard to understand but hard to accept as just. I say it is not hard to understand because I take for granted that these people are eager to escape Jewish life. But there is also involved a factor which I am at a loss to comprehend, the factor of superstition. The old man Nathan Strauss had his bust made by Glicenstein, when suddenly it occurred to him that to have one's bust made while alive might lead to the death of the sitter. That fear seems to keep back a good many from giving G. commissions to do work for them. Then, of course, there is the old Orthodox law that stands in the way of those who

identify Judaism principally as a regimen of ceremonial observances. The old man Rokeach was about to give G. an order for some piece of statuary, when his friends reminded him of the law in the Shulkan Aruk. G. tried to get Leo Jung to discover some loophole whereby they might be able to evade the law, but, of course, Jung could do nothing. A fine state of affairs this is, conducive to Jewish creativity in the plastic arts!

* * * *

Sunday, May 5, 1929, 12:00 Noon

I have to prepare for next week's SAJ Review the concluding part of the chapter on the Revaluation of the Concept Israel. The first part of the article is to be devoted to proving that Judaism has always contemplated Israel's original function and destiny entirely in terms of nationhood, i.e., in termssof collective life associated with a specific land. There is therefore nothing in Traditional Judaism to suggest what Israel could do in the world as a landless people.

This seems to be so self-evident that there should be no need of proving it, were it not that the Reform movement has repudiated nationhood from the role which Israel is to play. My task, therefore, is to ~~xx~~ prove the self-evident, which I find extremely difficult because of my inability to harp on a theme for any length of time as professional writers usually do. I have been cudgelling my brain for hours how to elaborate on so axiomatic a fact and yet have not found the way to do it. I shall try to write down in this book whatever comes to my mind on the subject since I have no one with whom to discuss the matter.

The main point I want to make is that Israel was highly conscious of its relationship to the land in which it developed its national life. It did not take that relationship for granted as

most nations do, but wove out of that relationship the main texture of its career in the world. It is true that in the Bible Israel is now and then spoken of as a nation before it entered the Land of Canaan. It is this fact which has misled Samson R. Hirsch into arguing that the Land was a mere incident to Israel's career as a nation, that career, according to him, being entirely determined by the Torah. But when we note the nature of the national consciousness which Israel is alleged to have possessed while it was in Egypt or in the wilderness we find that it was permeated with a sense of homelessness, of being not actually a nation but a nation in the making. There is nothing that so stands out about the Israelites in Egypt as that they regarded themselves as temporary sojourners ~~in~~ there destined to be led to the Land which their God has sworn to grant them. If the Torah is to be regarded as the principal instrument whereby Israel was moulded into a nation, Israel was surely not a nation in Egypt. And although the Torah was granted, according to the traditional view, to the Israelites in the Wilderness, it was not in the Wilderness that it formed them into a nation since the greater part of its contents point to the Promised Land as the theatre of Israel's life. The years spent in the wilderness are represented as preparatory to Israel's career as a nation.

8:00 P.M.

It is impossible to read the stories which tell of the Patriarchs without being impressed by the fact that the basic theme is how God enabled the Patriarchs to take formal possession of the Land of the Amorite and how He reassured them again and again that He will enable their descendants to take actual possession of it. On the basis of a few aggadic passages which reflect the religious polemic interests of rabbinic times Abraham has been wrongly pictured as having been called by God by virtue of his having discovered the truth

about the one and only God. The Torah knows nothing about Abraham as a religious philosopher. It is mainly interested in giving an account of the way God went about creating a people that would acknowledge Him as its God and obey His laws. It informs us that God chose Abraham to be the founder of that people. To achieve that purpose He commanded Abraham to leave his home and kindred (among whom he would naturally have had to worship other gods) and He directed him to the land of Canaan, promising at the same time to make him into a great nation, great by reason of prosperity and prestige. Abraham no sooner arrived in the land than God appears and says to him "To thy seed will I give this Land." This promise is reiterated ten times in the course of the Patriarchal epic. Why did not the Patriarchs enter into actual possession forthwith? There were two conditions that had to be met. One, Abraham had to prove his worth as a faithful and obedient vassel of God. Second, the Amorite who held the land had to fill the measure of sin before he could with justice be deprived of his land. This latter condition necessitated the sojourn of Jacob, his children and their descendants in Egypt. God's purpose with regard to forming the descendants of Abraham into a nation had to be suspended, as it were. When Joseph adjured the children of Israel to take his remains to Canaan when the time for their return came said "God will surely remember you, etc. (Gen. 50, 24) It was in this spirit of waiting to be called to their land that the Israelites are presumed to have lived in Egypt.

When the time for the exodus became ripe God sent Moses to lead the Israelites out of Egypt and to bring them to the Land (copy Exod 3,8 and 6,7-8). In the song which celebrates Israel's victory at the Red Sea it is made apparent that the main significance of the redemption from the yoke of Pharaoh lay in the fact that it enabled the Israelites to enter into possession of the Land that is described

as God's own. (Exod 15, 16b-17). It is on their way to the Land where they are to live as a nation that they received the laws which were to govern them. Those laws (except for the directions concerning the Tabernacle) contemplate the Israelites in possession of the Land. Their sojourn in the Wilderness would not have lasted longer than was necessary to effect the passage between Egypt and Canaan, and to prove their qualification as the people of God by bearing patiently under the trials which they had to incur in the journey. They fail in every one of the trials, they violate outright the prohibition against making an image of the Deity. Yet they would have entered the Land after having covered the distance that separated them from it. But they committed one sin which more than any other called forth the divine wrath. They sent spies to reconnoiter the Land and those spies brought back an evil report which threw the people into a panic of fear and despair. In expiation of that sin the Israelites had to journey about well nigh forty years in the Wilderness until the entire generation that left Egypt after the age of twenty one died out including Moses, Aaron and Miriam.

In the same way as Genesis unfolds the epic of adventure which had to be incurred by Israel's forbears to win the Land, so Deuteronomy plays variations on the theme of what their descendants will have to do to hold the Land. From the beginning to the end of Deuteronomy the one great concern is that Israel shall not forfeit its right to the Land. It is as though Moses were bringing the significance of Israel's experiences in the wilderness to a focus by pointing out their blaring upon Israel's destiny as a nation in the Land of which they were about to take possession. The first oration opens not as we might expect with a description of the Exodus but with a reference to the divine command to start on the last stage of the march to their destination. In section after section, Israel is reminded that all which it has gone through has been to train it and

and give it the wherewithal it might be able to attain its goal as a people in the Land. The aim and reward of its obedience to the laws of God are interminable possession of the land and the enjoyment of the wealth of its blessings in which it excels even the watered shores of the Nile. On the other hand in case of disobedience the Land will be forfeited and every conceivable disaster which was wont to follow in the train of invasion and conquest by enemy peoples would befall Israel. Thus in one uniform strain does Deuteronomy interpret Israel's fortunes and failures in terms of the part that it is to play in the Land.

If we were to take a survey of the other books of the Bible we would invariably meet with the same tendency to define Israel's experiences, backslidings, its failures and its hopes in terms of its relationship to the Land. Some of those writings belong to an earlier period than the Torah, some are contemporaneous with it, and some belong to a later period. But no "value" is so uniformly interpreted and emphasized as the "value" of the Land in its relation to Israel. The Torah however embodying as it does the teachings of the earlier propehts and enjoying as it does preeminence among the sacred writings of the Jewish people, its influence must be regarded as most decisive in the shaping of Judaism. When therefore we find the Torah intent upon making Israel's relationship to the Land its principle motif we cannot conceive how it could ever have been possible for the Jews to contemplate their functioning as a group without association with the Land. Tautological as all this may sound we find it necessary to harp on this fact in view of the opinion which is widely held among modern scholars that when the civilization of the Jewish people entered upon its theocratic stage during the period of the second commonwealth the Jews ceased to be a nation and became a church, an ecclesia. These scholars accustomed to thinking of nationhood as

the product mainly of political government and statehood, and finding that from the return to the inauguration of the Maccabean Dynasty the Jews were a vassal state with a minimum of political machinery conclude that the Jews became a Temple-community and passed into the class of organization best designated as church. Assuming that a church is a social or spiritual organization upon which territory exercises no determining influence (which fact is far from being admissible) they conclude that after the Return the life, the habits and the hopes of the Jews were those shared by a church, insofar as their conception of God now transcended the limitations of territory and nationhood. The Jews were accordingly an ecclesiastical entity, a Kingdom of priests. This view totally misrepresents the facts. Apart from what we would infer a priori from the nature of the Torah which dominated the life of the Jews that they could not possibly have thought of their future in any other but national-territorial terms, the actualities of Jewish history during the entire period of the second commonwealth confirm that inference.

The main support relied upon by those who imagine they can find a precedent in the past for divorcing the destiny of Israel from its local associations is the collection of prophecies contained in the latter part of Isaiah. While it is true that to the Torah Israel is unseparable from its Land, it is otherwise with the author or authors of those prophecies which speak of Israel as the servant of God destined to bring the light of truth and justice to the nations. That author may have been far ahead of times. His universalism ill comforted with the narrow nationalism of the lesser spirits fettered by the bonds of legalism. But now he can be appreciated and his teaching adapoted as the correct interpretation of Israel's mission to the peoples of the earth, a mission that is unhampered by the limitations of territorial interests. This type of argument is

blithely oblivious of the facts with regard to the anonymous author of the mission idea. Never did it occur to him to picture Israel as destined to achieve the goal as a landless people. On the contrary, like all the seers and lawyers of Israel he cannot help viewing the dispersion of the Jewish people with concern, except that ~~xxxxxxxxx~~ instead of losing heart as most of his contemporaries did who imagined that the dissolution of Israel was at hand, he in the firmness of his faith in the God of Israel concluded that even the dispersion was serving the purpose of acquainting the nations with the God of Israel. But that purpose was by no means to be final. It was only a mediatory step to the attainment of the final goal, that of Israel's restoration to its land. (copy Isaiah 49, 18-19).

I do not know why I couldn't have written the foregoing on ordinary paper, or what it is about this book that has stimulated me to put down my thoughts which would otherwise have remained in potentia. The one striking fact which I hit on in the course of my writing out the above was the one about the Book of Deuteronomy. I had never realized to what extent it is devoted to the interpretation of the significance of the Land.

This afternoon I worked out a very interesting lesson with the Senior Class of the Teachers Institute. I took as my clue the definition of Torah as civilization. I defined civilization as aiming at the self-fulfillment of the individual through the various relationships which constitute human life. The place of art in civilization is to accentuate the element worthwhileness in those relationships. Originally man found worthwhileness only in the relation of the individual to the cosmos. Then art was confined to religion. With the democratization, as it were, of worthwhileness art has invaded the fields of the specific relationships.

Tuesday, May 14, 1929, 2:30 P.M.

In any deliberate endeavor to maintain the continuity of the Jewish civilization the criterion of success in retaining the individual character of that civilization will be the degree to which the Jew will react affirmatively to the values God, Torah and Israel. It is apparent that before he can react affirmatively to those aspects of the Jewish civilization which are represented by the values God and Torah, that is to say, "before he can experience any urge to live as a Jew and to give to religion the central place which it always occupied in Jewish life, he must hold some positive convictions as to what constitutes the normal functioning of the Jews as a group, and as to what it is to be the status of that group in relation to other groups. We have pointed out that nationhood was the only type of collective functioning consistent with the continuity of Judaism. Whatever else Israel may denote or connote, it refers first and foremost to the nation which came into being as a nation in the Land of Israel and which retained its character as a nation because it persisted in reasserting its claim upon its Land for which it had been forcibly ejected and in backing up that claim with as much effort as conditions in the past permitted.

But what of the status of the Jewish people? We know with what unwavering uniformity Judaism assigned to the Jewish people the status of the divinely chosen among the nations. This conception of the status of the Jewish people is beyond all doubt so integral a part of the value "Israel," that it would be nothing less than misrepresentation for the Jewish people to account itself the same as the Jewish people of history if it were to content itself merely with nationhood and ignore entirely the fact that it was wont to regard itself as divinely chosen. Those elements in Jewish life in the past which contributed not only to its perpetuation but also to its uniqueness

cannot be ignored, for they are the sole means of establishing the vital identity in the process of cultural metabolism. Of the conscious factors which contributed to the survival of the Jews in the face of systematic persecution and oppression first place is undoubtedly to be assigned to the belief that they enjoyed the distinction of being the special object of divine providence, a belief held alike by the most naive and the most sophisticated. It is inconceivable that the Jews would have been capable of displaying such power of endurance if they had not been fortified by the doctrine of election. To assume that it is possible for the Jews to maintain their nationhood and their historic civilization even at the present time without believing that there is something to that nationhood and the civilization in which it finds expression, that is of significance to human life as a whole is to reckon without human nature. Jewish nationalists who contend that the sense of nationhood is its own justification and need not seek justification in any universal purpose are correct in their attitude so far as the outsider is concerned who would challenge the right of any people to maintain its nationhood. But their attitude is one of begging the question as far as those who are challenged are concerned. Once they feel the brunt of oppostion and attack their very sense of nationhood is "weakened and it is entirely ungermane to say that the sense of nationhood carries its own justification. To be sure one cannot change one's grandfather, but one's aption does affect one's grandchild. If we can help it we do not want to hand down to our grandchildren a liability which might earn us their imprecations. If we want to transmit to them Jewish nationhood we need to be convinced that such nationhood constitutes a high moral asset. We therefore cannot avoid either finding in or giving to Jewish nationhood a purpose that would justify the effort and struggle involved in keeping it alive. Such a purpose would constitute the equivalent of the traditional belief in Israel's divine election and therefore

the pragmatic revaluation of that belief.

After what we have found to be the case with regard to nationhood affording the only kind of social framework in which the Jews can play that role in the world which would be a continuation of the part they played under the name Israel it is unnecessary to enter into a detailed analysis of the fallacies in the mission idea as promulgated by Rreformists and neo-Orthodox. But the surface that idea seems to have so much in common with the doctrine of divine election that it is apt to recommend itself as the truest of all possible revaluations of that doctrine. What can be more plausible than to argue that the only pragmatic inference to be drawn from the belief that God chose us from among the nations is that He chose us to make Him known to the nations? We need accept the premise, but we can accept the conclusion. That is exactly what we mean by pragmatic revaluation. It is therefore necessary to point out that the trouble with the mission idea is that it has not gone far enough in the process of revaluation. It has stopped midway between the theurgic and semi-anthropmorphic conception of God's choice of Israel as His people, and the humanistic conception of groups and individuals living with a sense of purpose. The inference that the Jews have the task of making God known to the nations could have practical meaning only at a time when the Jews could conscientiously claim to having been the sole recipients of supernatural revelations and to being in possession of an infallible code of laws. As long as they were so minded they had good reason to set up their claims against the alleged claims of other nations "To make God known" has the ring of an actual task so long as it means to proclaim a supernatural revelation as a historic event. To a historic event all can serve as witness men, women and children regardless of their intellectual development. Such a task could therefore be the task of people who belonged to a particular nation, and whose application was a matter of birth and not a matter of choice.

Making God known, however, does not mean affirming the historicity validity and superiority of a specific supernatural revelation, but leading an exemplary life which shall have the effect of demonstrating the reality of God in the world or the meaning of God in human experience, then it is in no sense a ~~xxxxxxx~~ revaluation of the doctrine of Israel's divine election. Such a task can be fulfilled by anyone outside of Israel as well as within Israel. There is nothing in the career of Israel that can add anything to the obligatory or spiritual nature of the task except the fact that the career as such constitutes a demonstration of the divine in the world. But that career as a past event is the common property of mankind and has actually been appropriated by the greater part of mankind. One should therefore be able to fulfil that mission without necessarily being a Jew. Being physical descendants of a nation that once existed may cause a glow of self-satisfaction but imposes no extra burdens or responsibilities. The Israel which our ancestors regarded as divinely chosen was a nation in the truest sense of the term. Any mission idea which is to be regarded as the psychological offshoot of that doctrine of election must find its application to that same entity as the one about which the doctrine was conceived. It is in Israel's career as a future reality that the mission idea is to find application. That means that we have to remain within the limits of Jewish nationhood and find within that nationhood itself a justification for upholding it in the face of challenge.

To achieve that revaluation of the traditional doctrine of the divine election of Israel which shall be both pertinent and realistic, we should try to discover within that doctrine itself a psychological implication which when brought out into the open might prove to be a sound foundation on which to rear an effective rationale for the continuance of Judaism. Such an implication it should not be

difficult to find since in the most egoistic and vainglorious ideas that we may entertain about ourselves there is implied a tribute to some abstract ideal of excellence. It has been said that hypocrisy is the tribute which vice pays to virtue. In other words even in a hypocritical act there is latent a highly ethical implication. It stands to reason that if one lays claim to some superiority, whether the claim be true or not, he at least pays homage to that trait or ability by virtue of which he regards himself superior.

When the Jews affirmed that they were God's chosen nation their claim was tantamount to the assertion that they alone constituted a nation. They meant to emphasize that all the other groups and aggregates of individuals were not really nations. In support of this rendering of the doctrine of election we do not have to rely on the scripture in which the poet addresses God in the words "Thou art the one (God)and Thy name is One; and who is there like Thy people, the one nation in the world?" This rendering rests upon the entire outlook of ancient man to whom godhood was but a higher form of kinghood. He could not conceive a god without a people anymore than he could conceive a king without a people. The reverse was equally true. He could not conceive a people or nation without a god, any more than he could conceive a nation without a ruler or king. As soon as the Jews arrived at the belief that the gods of the other nations were non-entities so soon did they conclude that the other nations were not nations in the true sense of the term. (In the same way as the distinction is made between de facto and de ?(p.18)) They would only become such when like Israel they would come to acknowledge Israel's God who was the only true God.

Accordingly whatever other connotations there were latent in the doctrine of Israel'd divine election there was certainly that connotation which for the present discussion is in need of being

singled out, namely, that Israel regarded itself as the only true nation by reason of its being ruled over by the only Being who is God and of its allegiance to His code of laws. Preposterous and egotistic as we may deem this belief which the Jews had of themselves there is undoubtedly implied in not only a tribute to nationhood as the ideal arrangement under which human beings should live if they mean to achieve their summum borum but also the consciousness of a standard which nationhood must attain to fulfill its function.

It is often asserted that many ancient and barbarous people regarded themselves as divinely chosen (Sumner Folkways, p.70). For that matter every ancient people had its gods, yet would any one deny that the Jews succeeded in giving to the idea of God connotations which have widened the spiritual range of human life? The uniqueness of Judaism does not consist in having evolved values which were totally unknown to other peoples besides the Jews but in having carried the same values which it evolved in common with the rest of the world to pragmatic conclusions never dreamt of by the other peoples. In the same way as Judaism interpreted its God idea in so striking a fashion that its interpretation displaced the versions given to the God idea by other nations, so also did it succeed in contributing to the spiritual life of mankind a unique version of the idea of a divinely chosen people.

We are so used to the abstract process of reasoning inaugurated by the Greeks that we fail to appreciate the significance of any truth or "value" which is not conveyed to us in the formal and detached manner of general propositions, a manner practically unknown to the oriental cast of thought except in that literature known as the gnomic which snows signs of Greek influence. This is why the significance which Judaism attaches to nationhood has escaped us. The Jewish mind which has retained its oriental cast down to our day, the medieval

Jewish philosophers notwithstanding, experienced the moral and spiritual importance of nationhood as a factor in the development of human personality to a far more intense degree than any other people. It was not, however, a calmly thought out conclusion, but a deeply felt intuition achieved perhaps as a result of confluent circumstances unparalleled in any other group of families,clans or tribes. Being an intuition sensed by a type of mind not gifted with the power of generalization it remained confined to the people that perceived it. Hence the "value" of nationhood instead of being descanted upon in terms of general propositions became an obsession with the people that intuitively sensed the power for good that inhered in nationhood. That obsession was translated into the belief that they were the only true nation and that belief in turn derived its sanction from the fact that they were the only people to give their allegiance to the only true God. Since nothing could have been more inconceivable to the ancients than to connect the circumstance of giving allegiance to a certain deity with some fact which led that people to choose its deity, they reasoned that such allegiance was the sequel of the deity choosing his people. By this mode of reasoning the Jews ascribed to their God the act of choosing which bound them in allegiance to Him. Shelled out of the mode of thought and expression natural to the oriental mind the kerne idea of the doctrine of divine election of Israel is that nationhood is the principal spiritual opportunity by which man is enabled to fulfil himself to the utmost.

Although the value of nationhood never attained in Jewish thought that abstract and generalized form that might have rendered it communicable or perhaps because of that, it escaped becoming a mere way of speaking and gave rise to a rich and variegated series of practical expressions. That God chose Israel to be His people did not remain an inert idea, but gave point and unity to the entire

civilization by which the Jews lived. Every element in that civilization was regarded as contributing in some way to that self-realization which as the chosen of God they were in a position to achieve. What greater incentive to live in accord with that civilization - the Torah - than the knowledge that it was the principal means through which God indicated His special love for Israel? No wonder that whenever the Jew was about to read from the Torah the scroll of the Law which represented his national civilization that he pronounced the benediction "Blessed art Thou, etc." In other words the idea of divine election as the differentia which was intended to distinguish the nationhood of Israel from the nationhood of any other people has a radically different background of thought and sentiment from that which divine election has,let us say, in Calvinism. It is not the individual thanking God because he happens to be of those whom God for some reason known to Himself has selected for divine favor, but it is the individual thanking God that through the national civilization at his disposal he is given the opportunity of experiencing God's election. The election is contingent upon his living by the divinely given civilization of his people that is, upon his utilizing the nationhood of his people as sanction and of his purposes and as the directing spirit of the means to their achievement.

It is thus evident that the advantage to be derived from the principle of divine election accrues to the individual only as he identifies himself with the whole of Israel. The significance of this process of identification becomes apparent when it is realized that Israel does not mean only the generations contemporaneous with the life of the individual, but that National Being whose origin reaches back into the dim past and whose future is synonymous with eternity. It is only when the nationhood of a people attains that intensity which it acquired among the Jews that the National Being becomes objecti-

fied into a kind of organism. It is entirely beside the point to enter into the question as to the metaphysical or psychical reality that corresponds to the idea of such a collective being or organism. The important fact to note is that the mis en scene, as it were , of an individual who relives his people's past and lives in anticipation of his people's future is infinitely vaster and more copious in human experience, than that of the individual whose horizon is limited to the present. And it is this enlargment of the mis en scene that nationhood brought about in the mental life and consequent conduct of the Jew.

This is why it may be said that if other people achieved a group consciousness the Jews achieved a group self-consciousness, that is a consciousness in which good memory is long and group imagination far reaching. The individual Jew operated with a mental picture of Israel, etc. (copy notes) This Jewish self-consciousness inhered in every individual Jew who by dint of this enlarged mental horizon was far more human and spiritual than he could ever have been otherwise. This result was achieved for him by his intense nationhood. But the sense of nationhood itself/he was incapable of isolating and naming. Feeling its power, however, he used the only term by which he could identify and explain it, to wit: Israel the chosen of God.

The only condition, therefore, on which it is possible for Judaism to retain that characteristic value Israel which is a prerequisite to the retention of its other characteristic values, God and Torah, is that the Jews be prepared not only to foster their nationhood, but to see in nationhood as such whether it be their own or that of any other people the call of the spirit. This necessity constitutes the revaluation of the doctrine of the election of Israel and points to the mission of the Jewish people as inherent in its very functioning as a nation. In countering all opposition and difficulties

to the continuance of its career as a nation the Jewish people is upholding the cause of nationhood for all those who feel its urge by pointing to its own nationhood as proof that such urge may elicit the highest moral and spiritual powers of which man is capable.

It must be admitted that nationhood is not an easy cause to uphold. What with the abuses to which it is subject and which have actually perverted it into a power for evil - and what cause is so true or sacred as to be free from abuse or unamenable to perversion? - and what with the claims made for the various rival ideals of human cooperation, it requires considerable moral stamina to adhere to an intuition which has come down as part of one's spiritual patrimony. Throughout the centuries during which the Jews were challenged by Christendom and Mohammedanism Judaism unconsciously defended the cause of nationhood and national civilizations against world imperialism that made use of religion to bring all the peoples of the earth, if possible, under the ?(p.22) of a centralized bureaucracy. However, before Judaism came to grips with imperialism, it had to contend against the disruptive forces of individualism and anarchism, which in those days, like everything else in human life could not but take on a religious hue. Early Christianity was for a long time divided between the centripetal forces that tended to bring into being a new social organization the Church which was destined to take over the Roman Empire, and centrifugal forces which glorified the life in which all social responsibilities are spurned as a hindrance to salvation. Jesus himself and his immediate followers embodied the centrifugal aspect of Christianity. Judaism recognized in early Christianity a denaturalizing influence and therefore extruded it from its midst. Judaism's fears were substantiated when Paul insisted upon the abrogation of the Torah as an obstacle to salvation. As an antinomian Paul combated the principle of nationhood. Since, however, autonomianism

and anarchism whether religious or secular carry their own correlatives, the same Paul who abrogated national civilization and nationhood contributed more than any one else to the new lease upon life which Roman imperialism acquired by becoming Christian.

The hardest battle for its existence and indirectly for the cause of nationhood which Judaism had to wage was, of course, against the three great world imperialisms which had their centers respectively in Rome, Constantinople and Mecca. These empires crushed all national groups and subjected mankind to one or the other of the three organized priesthoods. The Jewish people held out until these empires themselves began to disintegrate and out of their ruins nations have begun to arise. The first to break up was the Roman Christendom. The Protestant movement marks the resurgence of nationhood in Western Europe. The Greek Orthodox Christendom in helping the Balkan peoples to rescue their nationhood from Mohammedan Imperialism has managed to hold its own against the rising tide of nationalism except where as in Russia historic causes whether religious or national are regarded as supporters of the bourgeois economic system.

1:00 A.M.: The rise of Turkey is the beginning of the fall of the Mohammedan empire.

* * *

Wednesday, May 15, 1929, 12:30 midnight

Last Saturday I had as guest for lunch a visitor from Detroit by the name of Ehrlich. He is evidently a disgruntled trustee of Rabbi Hershman's congregation. He is planning to interest a number of his associates in the establishment of a conservative congregation. He is thoroughly displeased with Hershman's inertia and failure to modernize the synagogue. He wants a service that shall be Jewish in spirit and content, but not orthodox. Having heard of the SAJ he wants the congregation which he expects to establish to adopt our type of

service. He is counting upon making use of the old synagogue from which Rabbi Hershman's congregation has moved away.

I assume that if he will succeed in carrying out his plans the SAJ and I will come in for a great deal of lambasting from Hershman.

Last Saturday afternoon Jacob Klein and his wife called. I had invited them to come in order to discuss with them the letter which Klein had sent to Leibovitz, and in which he resigned from membership on the Board of Trustees. Both Klein and his wife are very simple people whom it would be futile to try to convince that there is anything wrong with Judaism. They are very parochial in their outlook and the rabbi is to them chiefly a person to whom they could pour out their woes in time of trouble. He said that early in the year when he refused to act as chairman of the membership committee on the ground that he had not time and that he had done enough for the SAJ I replied, "What have you done for the SAJ?" After considerable discussion I got him to realize that I had intended no offense and as for my giving up the SAJ that would not be the case if I were to have the active cooperation of a strong administrative committee.

Sunday evening I had dinner at Chas. Goel's home. He celebrated the silver anniversary of his wedding. There were a few people all of his own kind. I was extremely bored. After dinner Rosenblatt, H. Liebovitz and I discussed the SAJ. Rosenblatt suggested that the SAJ get the services of a rabbi who would preach on Sabbaths and holidays and in addition do the work that Perlman, the executive director is now expected to do. I suggested Kadushin's name and promised to write to him. Before getting in touch with him I wanted to make sure that I would have no occasion to regret asking him to assume the rabbinate of the SAJ. If I could have the courage to eliminate myself

entirely from the picture I would probably write to him. But I am not so sure that I ~~do~~ have. Neither am I sure that Kadushin who will want at least $8000 which is the salary he is getting now, will be entitled to it. He is far from being sufficiently creative even as a preacher. Moreover his wife is a veritable spitfire. She would try to have him claim credit for a good deal that he would be getting out of me. I know how small it is of me to look at the matter in this light, but I do not want to hide from myself my own pettiness. I don't say that I shall make no effort to overcome it. I will probably write him anyhow asking him whether he would care to take the position and how much salary he would expect.

Monday I attended the annual luncheon of the Women's Division of the SAJ. I made a neat little speech in which I steered clear of the entire question as to the future of the SAJ.

Monday afternoon Dr. Honor, ~~Dinin~~ Samuel and Scharfstein came to the house to discuss the question of practice and pupil teaching to be arranged for the students of the TI. Sometime I feel as though I have no right to head the TI which deserves the full time and attention of any one who would really be interested in making of it a training school for Jewish teachers. I am so ambitious to do creative work that I have little patience for administrative details.

In the evening of that same day the trustees of the Matz Foundation met at my house. After the meeting was over I had a long talk with Rabbi Morris Levine about the inadvisability of leaving the entire matter of the TI students' attitude toward religion to be dealt with in the course which I give them in the Junior and Senior classess. I suggested the need of having those who teach Bible and History meet

me to arrive at a common understanding as to which ideas on religion and religious practices might be communicated to the students incidentally to all the studies at the TI.

Yesterday Dr. I. Rubinow had lunch with me at 1:00 P.M. at my house. He came to see me about a plan he had in mind, which might help him raise an additional $50,000 or thereabouts for the UPA. According to his report it looks as though the campaign will result in a shortage of five to six hundred thousand dollars from the amount they had expected to raise. His plan is that I should induce S. C. Lamport to raise about $50,000 among his friends.

I was shocked to learn from him ~~xxxxxxx~~ what he told me about Weizmann. Weizmann had given toward the (p.25) fund collected to keep Lipsky in office a note for $4000. A few months ago he wrote to the office to pay him that note from the Shekel collection. p.25

Today I had lunch with Rabbi Jesse Schwarz from Minneapolis. He is trying for the position in Cleveland. While there he went to see Rabbi Abba Hillel Silver. In the conversations which ensued Silver charged me with being the source and fountainhead of the secularism which, he said, tainted the efforts of men like Goldman, Schwarz and others who accepted my philosophy of Judaism.

Schwarz complained that his work is handicapped during the months of December, January and February by reason of the severe cold which usually prevails in Minneapolis then.

I can't make out Henry Rosenthal. On the one hand he says that if/I what state about Jewish nationhood (see pp.15~~22~~3) is true then he is no Jew, and on the other hand, he fights tooth and nail against making Sabbath any day which it might be economically and socially feasible to observe, even after the new calendar shall have destroyed the traditional fixity of the days of the week.

Thursday, May 16, 1929, 12:30 Noon

I am sending the following letter to Rabbi Kadushin. It took me more than an hour to write it. As I was writing it I thought to myself "You no sooner try to work with somebody else than you have to be wary of what you say. This business of weighing words takes up a lot of time and energy."

"Dear Rabbi Kadushin, You know, I presume, that much as I have tried to interest the members of the SAJ in the furtherance of Jewish cultural undertakings for the community in general as the main raison d'etre of the organization, they insist upon regarding themselves as organized mainly for congregational purposes. That being the case, I consider the rabbinic services which I am in a position to render entirely inadequate. They need the services of a rabbi who could give all of his time to them. He would have to preach, take charge of the Hebrew School, and direct the activities of the adults, in other words, do exactly what you are doing now for your congregation. They could then dispense with the services of an executive director, since the membership is comparatively small and there are no communal center activities being carried on in the building of the SAJ.

"What I would like to know is, first, whether you would care to fill that position in the SAJ; secondly what salary you would expect and thirdly, what, in your opinion, should my position and function in the SAJ be so that you might feel that you are aided in your work by reason of your association with me.

"Kindly let me hear from you if possible by Monday morning.

"With kindest regards to you and Evelyn, Yours sincerely..."

A good deal of the time in formulating the letter was taken up with the first of the three questions. I am not satisfied even now with the way it reads, but I have to let it go as it is.

12:00 midnight

Last Tuesday I sent to Morris Rothenberg, acting president of the ZOA letter of resignation from the chairmanship of the Administrative Committee.

Some days pass without my accomplishing a single thing. This day was one of them. I imagine that seeing a play or a movie would counteract my inward restlessness, but most of the shows bore me to distraction.

I have had the hay fever since May 1 and have been taking treatment since May 3. My worst days were Thursday, May 9 - Tuesday, May 14. Today I have been myself again. During those days when the onset was severe I felt grippy most of the time and had yellow discharge from the nose. Last Monday I could hardly speak for hoarseness.

* * *

Saturday night, May 18, 1929

I shall give an account of the way I spent yesterday. Rose at 8:30. Went to the physician for treatment 9:30. Came to the Seminary 10:00 to give examination in Midrash. Got back home by 11:15. Had lunch at 12-12:30. Walked to the 42nd St. Library. While walking I worked on the plan of the article for the SAJ Review. Worked in the Library from 2:00 to 5:00. Went to services at 6:30. After supper called on Nathan Levy. It was 11:15 when I got home. Then prepared sermon for today. Went to bed 1:15.

* * *

Monday, May 20, 1929, 6:00 P.M.

I should have stayed home this afternoon and tried to write the article on nationhood. Instead I went to the park with my brief case filled with books in the expectation of doing my work there.

As I started walking I recalled that Glicenstein whose studio I had visited last Saturday together with Joe Levy, said he wanted to make a drawing of me. I thought that I would go to his studio and suggested to him that he should make a bust of me instead of a drawing, so that the prejudice against having one's form sculpured might be broken down among some of the people who know me. When I got to the studio at 2:30 Glicentstein began telling me about his troubles and to show me his new pen drawings. This took more than an hour. Then he informed me that he did not have any clay and that it was necessary for him to make a drawing of me first. I sat for him for about two hours. When Lena will see the drawing she will probably be horrified. It is by no means flattering, to say the least. But for that matter, none of his drawings is. He conversed with me a good deal but most of the time I find it hard to get at the exact meaning he wants to convey. He thus alluded to the fact that he hadn't eaten yet and that his son was afraid to come back to the studio. Did he mean that he hadn't what to eat? God knows. I am sorry I asked him to make the bust of me.

12:30 midnight

I am nothing but a pusillanimous and vacillating nincompoop if I could have allowed myself to accede to a budget for the SAJ which involves eliminating even the few activities that have been carried on hitherto limiting the school staff to two teachers instead of the three that we have now, and withal consenting to function as rabbi.

I can already feel the paralyzing effect of the self-suppression in the difficulty I am experiencing in writing down these sentences. If I were free how well I would have been able to describe the scene which occurred when I apprised Lena of my escapade this afternoon. She berated me for being such a fool as to fall into the hands of an artist. He will give me no rest that I should get

patrons. On the other hand he too has a right to live. Why should we be so hard hearted as to let him starve.

* * *

Thursday, May 23, 1929, 5:00 P.M.

No words could state more accurately the arguments that make a coward of me than those in the article in Harper's Monthly Magazine (June, 1929) by Harold J. Laski: He writes, "One who seeks to work for the acceptance of truth rejected by the powers that be embarks upon a voyage where he can be certain his ship will be wrecked. The authority of existing interests is so strong that it is folly to rebel against their compulsion...We have our own happiness to achieve; we are not, in any case, our brother's keeper. What profit does a man have who sets himself up for Athanasius? It is rare that his powers are equal to his self-appointed task. He will earn only bitterness and disappointment from effort of which the world is careless. Those whom he loves will only too often pay the price of his sacrifice to his conscience. His spiritual urgency will, to the generality, seem no more than a special form of egotism or stubbornness."

The sentence I've underlined hits the bull's eye. Had I possessed a facile pen or an eloquent tongue I would have dared Satan himself. It is the fear that if I were involved in a conflict I would find myself short of the ammunition, or incapable of using the little I have with telling effect that has prevented me from declaring war against the intellectual dishonesty of the Seminary and United Synagogue chhorts.

I am experiencing considerable difficulty in writing out the sequal to last week's article in the SAJ Review. I have set myself the task of proving that the Jews' chief mission in the world is to demonstrate that nationhood is the call of the spirit. Let me now

formulate the ideas which I have arrived at as a result of a week's reading and thinking on the subject.

It is impossible for the Jews to play in the future the part for which history has qualified them unless they are prepared to combat the dangers of the nationhood that is and to dedicate themselves to the nationhood that ought to be. The world does not need the Jews to promulgate the virtues of nationhood, but to render nationhood virtuous. To do that they must not only appreciate fully the deeply rooted need in human nature to which nationhood answers, but realize how the very fact of its satisfying a human need renders it amenable to abuse. To cultivate a sharp eye for these abuses however is not enough. It is above all necessary to have a clear and compelling notion of the specific outlet which this human need must find in order that the nationhood to which it gives rise shall bring blessing instead of calamity.

The human being to live his life with any degree of adequacy requires an environment which possesses the character of permanence. It is a commonplace that the ambit of a human individual extends far beyond his body. It includes as much of his environment, animate and inanimate as he interacts with. The human being is not his body but the world he carries as it were, with him. When men still dwelt in caves the cave and the small family group constituted as much of the environment as the individual human being regarded as indispensable to his life. As time went on and whole families learned to live together and move from place to place with the change of seasons the world - the environment - which constituted the ambit of each individual's life was not only enlarged but attained a degree of permanence which extended beyond that individual life. The phratry, clan and tribe which came to exercise its control over the life of the individuals constituting them represent the enlarging environment with

which the human being learned to identify himself. The only world in which the individual found the permanence that gave much larger meaning and purpose to his life was the human one, the social environment. With the next stage in the evolution of the race, when men gave up their nomadic habits and learned to till the soil and live on its hield, there was added another factor that gave stability to the human world of clan and tribe, and helped to enlarge that world into federation of tribes, a federation made necessary by the contingencies of war in defiance of the soil upon which they had come to depend. Thus the attachment to one's people became interwoven with attachment to one's country and the individual human being came to look upon his people retaining its land as the sole condition to its possessing that permanence which gave significance and direction to his life. With other tribes or groups of tribes ever lurking for an opportunity to invade his country and take possession of it he had to be every ready to join his own people in their defense of the country that was theirs as well as his. If the invader was driven off there were tales of danger, adventure and victory to tell. Insofar as these experiences were shared by the individual his life was enriched. He, in turn, was stimulated to deeds of valor in times of crisis for he could not but sense that whatever might befall him personally every added the greater the security and power of his people the more permanent and fruitful his investment in it. Thus arise history and art. Patriotism is an intuition of the truth which sophisticated man becomes fully aware of only after many centuries of reflection. (The essense of nationhood is not the state which is limited to the machinery of government, but the cultural complex/or civilization) That a person's true self is not bounded by his body, but by the frontiers within which there obtains the mutual influence between him and his world. Nationhood is the realization that those

to whom one is bound by cultural ties constitute if not the whole of one's world but at least so important a part of it that he cannot shirk his responsibility for its continuance and power without jeopardizing his own self. Since possessing a common territory is the primary condition to a common culture it is the normal basis of a sense of nationhood. So conceived both patriotism and nationhood are merely laws of the functioning of the human spirit, laws that derive from the social aspect of human nature.

* * *

Friday, May 24, 1929

I don't seem to be able to go ahead with the argument though intuitively I can see the goal ahead of me. I feel like a person who knows in what direction his destination lies, yet is prevented from getting there because there is no path leading to it. What I mainly want to say about nationhood is that it is that tendency in human nature which Judaism would have us employ deliberately (it has hitherto been applied for the most part unconsciously) to transform the sovereignty of the state from one based upon power and dominion to one based upon justice and commonweal. It seems to me that this conception of nationhood helps to clarify the confusion created in one's mind by the various theories of state that have been propounded, theories which either deal with what the state ought to be or with its origin conceived logically or historically. Oppenheimer's theory of the origin of the state seems to come nearest to historical actuality. We do not have to revert to the distant past for proof. Every state in the world is still a dominion based on the exploitation of the weak by the strong. But there can be no question that there is today a greater measure of justice in the states of the world than there was in the past, i.e., there is either less of exploitation or there appears to be less. Even if only the latter be true justice has

has made some progress. This progress may be attributed to nationhood insofar as nationhood is selfhood realizing that a state which is based upon dominion is bound to suppress it. The selfhood of each member of a state is contingent upon the establishment of justice.

* * *

Saturday night, May 25, 1929

This morning I tried to live up to Lask's advice in the article referred to on p. 28. The occasion was the graduation exercises of SAJ Hebrew school to mark the completion of the elementary course by three pupils. Up to about eleven o'clock the services were conducted with a handful of people present. The prospect of holding the exercies with so small an attendance and having to deliver a message which was entirely out of place with the majority of those, I counted on being away set me on edge. I had to do all I could to hold back from screaming out every time something happened that had no right to happen in a properly conducted service when some one would begin to converse with his neighbor, or the janitor began banging on the windows to get them to open. By the time I rose to speak there was a fairly large audience. The main point of the talk dealt with the type of Jewish education which it was necessary to develop in correspondence with the aim of the SAJ. I defined that aim as consisting in the promulgation of a way of life which was based upon the principle of a maximum of Jewishness that is to be given ethical aesthetic and religious expression. The fundamental requisite of such a type of education was intellectual honesty. When I came to this point all the pent up rsentment against the hypocrisy that prevails in the Jewish religious schools where the teachers are afraid to express their honest convictions or doubts broke out like a torrent, reenforced by a feeling of despair at the apathy of the members of the SAJ. After I got through I knew that this time my

emotions spoke more effectively than my tongue and that they charged the atmosphere with sufficient electricity to strike and shock some one. Before the services were over just as the congregation began to sing En Kelohenu, Unterberg came up to me on the platform and began to blabber about my hurting the Jewish Education Association with the talk I gave. "Who would care to give any money for Jewish education if what you said was true? Hasn't the JEA organized a License Board to deal with that problem?" I couldn't make out what he wanted me to do right there and then. Did he expect me to retract what I had said, or what? When the service was over and I stopped to say Gut Shabbas (they never come to me to say Gut Shabbas) he continued in the same strain, and was joined by his son-in-law Sam Dereckter and Harry Liebovitz. At first I tried to argue, but when I saw it was futile I lost my temper and screamed at the top of my voice "Have I not the right to speak the truth? If not from the pulpit where else shall I say what I know to be the sad fact about Jewish education?"

Never a day passes but there is something the matter with me. If it isn't an upset stomach, it's general weariness; if it isn't weariness it is hay fever. The same is true of my social adjustments. I no sooner settle down to a few days of peace after having patched up with some one or another to whom I have given offense than I get into trouble with somebody else. And it isn't always due to differences about personal matters. Very often it is for what I believe to be the right, the cause of honesty and freedom. Every one of these squabbles costs me not only health but peace of mind. For a few days after each such outbreak I am unfit to do any serious work.

As I was walking with Lena this afternoon and discussing today's episode and we were deploring the state of affairs in human life which renders the world unsafe for honesty of purpose there oc-

curred to me the notion that probably the reason Providence allows so much corruption to exist in the world is that we should not regret leaving it when our time is up. Death would be infinitely more tragic if this world were really the decent place to live in we should like it to be.

This afternoon E. Glicenstein, the sculptor, called me up and pleaded pitifully that I should come to his studio. When I mentioned to him that I do not want him to go on with my bust I could sense over the phone that he was shocked. "Do you mean to disappoint me like the rest? You were the only one I had faith in and please don't shatter my faith." My heart wept when I heard him speak in that tone. I can't be as hardboiled as Lena ~~xdixx~~ advises me to be toward him. She thinks it is for his good that I should not let him work on my bust, because if I do he will expect some of my friends to buy it from him, and he will be sorely disappointed if they won't.

Unfree as I am to order my life as I should like to I am naturally not a very happy man; yet what is my unhappiness to that of a man like Glicenstein?

I have hardly ever written a word about my mother. Convention and taboo demand that we be silent about our parents unless we can speak of them in a laudatory view. Probably there is some value to the interdict so long as one receives from one's parents the slightest evidence of unselfish consideration. When a parent displays towards his child signs of meanness toward him he forfeits any claim to respect from him. This is unfortunately how I feel about my mother. I know she is a sickly woman, yet her ailments do not prevent her from coming all the way from Brooklyn to see the jeweler about an old candelabra of hers and not stepping into my house after an absence

of months, although the jeweler's store is around the corner from where I live. Today I went with Lena to pay a dondolence call at Mrs. E. L. Solomon's. There I learned that mother and Sophie were there two days ago. The Solomon's live only a few blocks away from us. I really don't know whom to blame - Mother or Sophie. I feel in my heart that Sophie doesn't like me. She wishes me well - at a distance. She hates me because I do not bend heaven and earth to get a congregation for Phineas. The fact that I cannot conscientiously recommend him or make use of his services is of no consequence to her/ Brotherhood in her opinion must override all other considerations.

* * *

Sunday, May 26, 1929, 11:15 A.M.

The exigencies of my work prevent me from giving as much time as I should like to the reading and study of Hebrew subject matter. Time and again I am overcome by a feeling of homesickness for Hebrew. If I yield to that feeling and spend some time reading Hebrew I am rewarded by a sense of at homeness as though I were once again among my own. It is then that I also enjoy a good dose of pious sentiment and prefer it to the modern pragmatic claptrap. I just picked up, for example, Bahyas' Duties of the Heart p. 34 . I drank in every word as though my soul had been parched. The few opening paragraphs put me into a spiritual mood such as I seldom experience. Very often as I put on my tephilin (of late, somehow, I have allowed days and recently even a whole week to pass without putting on the tephilin - I can't account for these omissions) I search about for something that might put me into a prayerful mood, but without success. When I pick up the Bible I fall into the study mood, which is just what I want to get away from. When I turn to the little books issued by the Association press, I am revolted by the christology in them. The result is that I am spiritually starved.

Being a migrant ף כא from one culture to another, being an exile in the English culture (as one can see by my labored style) and being without a home in the Hebrew culture, is not calculated to promote in me that unity and integration of personality which is said to be a prime requisite to happiness.

Some hours have passed since I wrote the foregoing and I am still sucking as it were, on that juicy morsel of an interpretation I came across in the Hobot HaOlebabot where Bahya renders ף כא as implying that the written word is so much more valuable than the spoken word because it has permanence.

Well, well, well. "He stuck in his thumb, and pulled out a plum," etc. I certainly was a good boy tonight. I didn't know I can be so good and could say so many nice things (which by the way were also good things) about other people. If ever I was in an ironic mood it was tonight at the annual meeting of the SAJ. Perhaps there will be a change for the better with Klein as chairman, and an active executive committee meeting regularly once a week the SAJ might grow in number, and interest aroused among the members. It was probably the prospect of that, the excellent report rendered by the retiring chairman, the well articulated remarks of Klein that put me into a happy frame of mind, with the result that I said exactly what I ought to have said tonight neither more nor less. I defined clearly the function of the SAJ as being that of inaugurating a movement to interpret and live Judaism as a civilization, a movement made necessary by the mistakes of Reform and Orthodoxy. I made clear to the audience the nature of the crisis the SAJ passed through recently on account of my attempt to have the SAJ give up its congregational activities. I admitted that I realized that we were not ready to part with the congregational form

אין תוכן בעמוד זה

of our functioning, so long as we were not fully obsessed by the urge to give of our money, time and energy to the promulgation of Judaism as a civilization, of a maximum of Jewishness which is to find expression in ethics esthetics and religion.

On the whole, although I haven't added today anything to the book I am working on, it has been a day quite well spent.

* * *

Monday, May 27, 1929, 9:45 P.M.

I took this picture this morning on the way from Dr. Spivak to thelibrary of the Union Theological Seminary. I suppose it is vanity that prompts me to have my picture taken or my bust made or to have a phonographic record made of my voice as I tried last Friday. But is there not also an innate desire to want to know more about oneself? Perhaps also the wish to snatch from the ravenous maw of Time something that might endure - if at least for a little while. I notice that I aged quite perceptibly within the last year, judging by the previous picture in this Diary. After listening to the "cheering" remarks by the physician about the blood becoming acidy when it secretes a good deal of water on account of a running nose caused by the hay fever signs of aging do not exactly predispose one to being gay. I have to laugh at myself when I recall what passed through my mind when I caught sight of the series of snapshots of which the foregoing is one. I said to myself "No wonder young people take me for a bear when they first meet me. I can understand now why people say I always look angry. I recall Schechter applying to me the Yiddish epithet [illegible]. I there and then made up my mind that I must assume a pleasant expression. During the rest of my walk I must have looked as though I was obeying a photographer's order to look pleasant. During the rest of the day, however, my shoes pinched me so savagely that I forgot all about the resolve made in the morning, and continued to look probably like a Male Niobe.

This afternoon I called on Glicenstein and delivered to him my little speech in German which I had rehearsed to myself. I tried to explain to him that the reason I did not want him to go on with the bust was that I believed it was unfair of me to allow him to expend his talent on making a bust of me when there was not the least prospect that anyone would care to buy the bust. He replied that the late Prof. Herman Cohen had expressed similar scruples as he was about to proceed with a bust of him, but he waved those scruples aside. So longas I was to pay for the material and he was willing to do it I ~~might~~ ought to let him go on with it. I arranged to sit for him next Thursday.

While I was in his studio the Jewish composer Achron called. Before long Glicentein took up the theme of creative work as our true Palestine. He denounced the tendency to place a premium on virtuosity. "The Goyim have their Beethovens and Mozarts and we have our Heifetz and Munshins." When Achron tried to say a word in defense of the interpretaive arts Glicenstein poured out an avalanche of abusive epithets against the encouragement of virtuosity. "We are parasites," he cried out.

I had a long talk this afternoon with Honor about his accepting the position offered him by Dushkin in Chicago. Although his leaving the Institute would deprive me of valuable help I really could advance no reason for advising him against seizing the opportunity he has of bettering himself materially and professionally. I suggested to him to make sure that Dushkin would give him a free hand in training the teachers in the spirit of absolute intellectual honesty, which meant insisting upon presenting the narrative material in the Pentateuch as ancient sagas and in no sense as history.

I experienced one of those rare moments of serene joy when Judith of her own accord asked me to read with her Aggadah and after we read Aggadah for a while she asked me to read Job.

This morning I read a book by H. A. Miller entitled Races, Nations and Classes. I was very much irritated by the evident inconsistency of his argument. After devoting the greater part of the book to proving how powerful a factor nationalism is in the life of people, bending even religion to its uses, he concludes his book with the hope that men will be dominated by those interests which cut across national affiliations. It is just such half thought out ideas about nationhood that fill most of the books on the subject of nationalism. I have had to read Hocking's book on Man and the State and Hegel's Philosophy of History to find any significant idea on the subject of nationhood. These writers too would have been more illuminating and less misleading if most of what they say about the State they had taken care to apply to the nations instead.

Implied in the doctrine of the divine election of Israel is that affirmative attitude toward the national bond of unity as the occasion and stimulus to the spiritual self-fulfillment of the human being. We shall designate that attitude as the moral evaluation of nationhood. That evaluation is based on the assumption that the world from which a person derives the basic habits that go to form his human personality, the world which must exist as a condition to his being able to pursue his life purposes, and the world where (except he be a type of universal genius) his contribution to life is ultimately deposited and keeps on producing most results is the world of human beings to whom he is related by bonds of nationhood. We might prove this negatively by reminding the reader of what the term a man without a country conveys. But we

shall appreciate more fully what nationhood means for the individual human being by noting in detail how little other applications, such as those based upon kinship, occupation, friendship, common philosophy of life, etc. can compare with nationhood in the share which they have in the shaping of human personality.

This truth about nationhood does not yet constitute its moral value. It merely accentuates/the potentialities of nationhood. Historically these potentialities have seldom been employed entirely in the cause of the universal and absolute good. As a matter of fact they have been employed in the cause of limited and relative goods as against the universal and absolute good. At this point I have to mention the various ways in which nationhood has been exploited to fan hostility between nation and nation, and among the groups of the same nation, as well as to good men to engage in wars against their own interests.

These very abuses of nationhood point to the need not of minimizing its potentialities nor of trying to eradicate them (it is impossible to start humanity on a nationless program because that would involve destroying the existing civilizations) but to canalize them so that they shall develop the personality of the individual in such a way as to redound to universal good and happiness. This involves employing nationhood as a means of converting the State which is the political expression of nationhood from one based upon domination, to one based upon commonweal. This means selecting from the influences historically wielded by nationalism those which helped to overcome imperialism, despotism and injustice in all its forms and to further the cause of freedom and self-determination and adopting those influences as the true expression of nationhood. The Jews have in their own history sufficient examples of such influences emanating from its own urge to nationhood

The prophetic movement combats internal despotism, the Hasmonean revolt, the various rebellions against Rome, the passive resistancy to Christendom and Mohammedanism are manifestations of Jewish nationhood pitted against imperialism and foreign tyranny. (2:00 A.M.)

* * *

Tuesday, May 28, 1929

This afternoon Dr. Tschernowitz called in acknowledgement of the decency I showed in visiting him at the Mt. Sinai Hospital during his recent illness. He was certainly at death's door and he probably possesses unique recuperative powers to have escaped alive.

He gossipped about Dr. Obermann, a colleague of his on the Faculty of the JIR who is at present giving a course at the Hebrew University. There was never much love lost apparently between the two men. Obermann seems to be a hater of the Talmud and he probably gave expression to his contempt for T's. courses, and Tsch. must have returned in kind. Tsch. must therefore be happy that Obermann committed a faux pas which led to his dismissal from the JIR. Obermann is supposed to have said to some person in authority in Palestine that he was a member of the Faculty of Columbia, and to have forgotten that he was on a leave with salary from the JIR. This made Wise extremely indignant and O. was asked to explain. The explanation did not come. The students in the meantime voiced their dissatisfaction with O. and declared their preference for Dr. Torcyzner who will mast likely receive a permanent appointment.

I am very much upset by the decision of the U.S. Supreme Court announced today approving the refusal of the lower courts to grant her citizenship because she refused to bear arms in case of war by a vote of six to three. Justice Holmes and Brandeis were of

the minority opinion. I am troubled first by the fact that her refusal to bear arms is interpreted by the majority opinion as proving that she has no sense of nationalism despite her ardent avowal that she found the U.S. nearest her ideals of a democratic republic. The fact that she is an uncompromising pacifist, with no sense of nationalism, but only a cosmic sense of belonging to the human family. "So runs the majority opinion. And here I am laboring to formulate a conception of nationalism which shall be not only compatible with but lead necessarily to pacifism. Of course I shan't allow six ancient sentinels of the status quo, who probably have little brains (as shown by their stupid argument to cover up the fallacy that a woman doesn't have to bear arms anyhow) and less moral courage to change the course of my thinking. This is not a question of what is but of what ought to be, and in that I have as much right to my opinion as the entire U.S. Supreme Court.

The second consideration which annoys me is that objections on ethical grounds to any outworn standard carry no weight. The objection must be given a religious, i.e., a theurgic sanction. Perhaps I am wrong in drawing this conclusion, and the line drawn is not between ethical and religious but between an individually conceived ethical standard and one conceived collectively.

If I were to have acted on the impulse of the moment I would have sent back my citizen papers and resigned my citizenship.

My task at present is to prove that one's nation is of far greater significance to one's life than the particular group with which one may have some economic or particular cultural interest in common. This should be easy to prove if we hold fast to the fact that nationhood is the sense of unity with that group from which one receives one's basic culture. No culture could arise except

among a group whose individuals are territorially contiguous to each other. No matter how important our vocational interests may be it cannot have as much to do with determining our character and personal happiness as the habits formed during the first few years of life. Since these habits are moulded in the environment of the family and the family is a cell which is determined in its nature and trend of function mainly not by any religious or vocational group but by the national group it follows that it is national group which has most to do with determining our destiny. Likewise when we establish a family it will not be our vocational interest that will have most to do with determining the inner development of our children but the nation to which that family has to give an accounting. The fact that the nation is the social unit which gives stability, purpose and direction to the life of the family is sufficient to prove that the nation is the chief determining influence in a person's life.

The illusion responsible for the error that the particular economic or religious group in which we take an interest is the chief determinant of our fate is that one's contemporaries being visible and coming in personal contact with us exercise a greater amount of influence than the generations that are gone. A careful observation of what actually takes place will convince us that the contemporaries as well as we are under the domination of the cumulative effect of the life of past generations. Since these past generations constitute one's nation, it follows that one's nation is more truly one's destiny than the most intimate associates in any calling or ideal.

* * *

Wednesday, May 29, 1929

Compare the following:

(p. 41 - Hebrew)